

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER DEWAYNE SMITH,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:20-CV-926-WHA-CSC
	)	[WO]
MAC SIM BUTLER MONTGOMERY	)	
COUNTY DETENTION FACILITY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff, an indigent state inmate incarcerated at the Montgomery County Detention Facility, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint on November 12, 2020. After reviewing the complaint and finding deficiencies with this pleading, the court determined that Plaintiff should be provided an opportunity to file an amended complaint to correct the deficiencies. On December 2, 2020, the court entered a detailed order explaining the deficiencies in the complaint and providing Plaintiff with specific instructions regarding filing an amended complaint. Doc. 4. The court specifically advised Plaintiff that this case will proceed only on “those claims set forth and defendants named in the amended complaint” and cautioned him that his failure to comply with the directives of the order would result in a Recommendation this case be dismissed. Doc. 4 at 4.

The time allowed Plaintiff to file the amended complaint expired on December 16, 2020. As of the present date, Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint as required by this court. Because of Plaintiff’s failure to file the requisite amended complaint, the court concludes this case should be dismissed. *Tanner v. Neal*, 232 F. App’x 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate’s § 1983 action for failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with court’s prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure

to comply); *see also Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (explaining that as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that “[t]he district court possesses the inherent power to police its docket. . . . The sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice.”).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff’s failures to comply with the order of the court and to prosecute this action.

**On or before February 19, 2021**, Plaintiff may file an objection to the Recommendation. Plaintiff must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which he objects. Plaintiff is advised that frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file a written objection to the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the district court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. 11TH Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done, this 5<sup>th</sup> day of February 2021.

/s/ Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE